

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6-15, 21-24 and 31-47 as amended herein remain pending in the application with the present amendments. Claims 1-5, and claims 16-20 are cancelled herein. In the final Official Action, all of the claims were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,247,994 B1 to DeAngelis et al. ("*DeAngelis*"), or as obvious over *DeAngelis* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,322,451 B1 to Miura ("*Miura*"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently amended claims overcome the rejections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended herein, claim 6 now recites a method in which an information processing device is connected to a plurality of unitary operation terminals. Each of the operation terminals includes a transceiver for providing bi-directional communication with the information processing device. Each operation terminal is operable by a user to generate input and to transmit the input via the transceiver to the information processing device. The information processing unit generates correlation information and outputs it to the plurality of operation terminals. The operator terminals receive the correlation information and indicate the correlation to the user based on the received correlation information.

DeAngelis neither teaches nor suggests these features of the invention as recited in claim 6. *DeAngelis* merely describes a pad 42a through which the user selects a vehicle unit 12, separate from the pad, to control using the pad. *DeAngelis* merely teaches that the pad contains an indicator such as an LED 93 to show the user which vehicle he

has selected through the pad. Communication from the pad 42a to a central station 64 is in one direction only, and communication is in one direction only between the central station 64 and the vehicle 12. There is no direct communication between the pad and the vehicle. Clearly, *DeAngelis* neither teaches nor suggests a "unitary" operation terminal, nor does *DeAngelis* teach an operation terminal that has a transceiver for providing bi-directional communication between the operation terminal and an information processing device. In addition, *DeAngelis* fails to teach the transmission of correlation information from the information processing device to the operation terminal regarding a correlation between the operation terminal and specific information processing that is controlled by the operation terminal. Nor does *DeAngelis* teach indicating the correlation to the user based on correlation information received by the operational terminal from the information processing device.

Moreover, *DeAngelis*, and the combination of *DeAngelis* with *Miura* both fail to teach or suggest the features of the invention as recited in the independent claims 12, 15, 21, 24, 31, 37, and 43, which include recitation similar to those highlighted above.

Support for the present amendments is provided, *inter alia*, at ¶¶[0033]-[0034] and ¶¶[0037]-[0039].

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully


requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By


Daryl K. Neff

Registration No.: 38,253

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants